



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/751,520

12/29/2000

Bradley J. Quinn

1840

8825

30408

7590

05/03/2006

GATEWAY, INC.
ATTN: PATENT ATTORNEY
610 GATEWAY DR.
MAIL DROP Y-04
N. SIOUX CITY, SD 57049

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/751,520	Applicant(s) QUINN, BRADLEY J.	
	Examiner Mylinh Tran	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-22, 27-32 and 34-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-22, 27-32 and 34-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to amendment, filed 02/15/06. Claims 1-15, 17-22, 27-32, and 34-39 are pending in this application. In this amendment, no claim is canceled, claims 1, 9, 13, 19 and 27 are amended. This action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-22, 27-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman [US. 6,288,716] in view of Rezvani et al. [US 2003/0140090 A1].

As per independent claim 1, Humpleman teaches a method of configuring a user interface, comprising:

receiving, through a network to the information appliance, user interface data describing one or more user interface functions on a remote device, wherein at

least some of the one or more user interface functions may be added to the information appliance from the remote device (col. 7, lines 6-7 and col. 7, lines 48-58);

assigning the one or more representations of the information appliance respectively to the one or more user interface functions of the remote device (column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 2);

programming the assigned one or more representations of the information appliance to respectively control the one or more user interface functions of the remote device (column 9, lines 21-29 and lines 59-63);

configuring the user information appliance to add a display of one or more representations based on the user interface data, each representation corresponding to one of the user interface functions on the remote device and capable of interaction by a user therewith (col. 7, lines 7-20 and col. 7, lines 48-58).

Humpleman does not teach comparing the user interface data with a user interface template of the information appliance, the user interface template including one or more representations. Rezvani discloses Web server 46 may take the template, locate components designated to device 32 using the components' IDs, and ask the components to generate a suitable user interface representation (page 9, paragraph 94). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Rezvani of generating a suitable user interface representation by comparing components' IDs to the

template, locate components designated to a remote device in Humpleman's system since it would have helped to speed up the process of loading user interface representation;

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Humpleman teaches: accepting input corresponding to the interaction by the user with a selected one of the representations; and communicating the input to the remote device through the network such that the user is able to utilize the user interface function on the remote device corresponding to the selected representation (col. 7, lines 41-47).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, it is inherent in Humpleman's system to translate the input into utilization by the user of the user interface function on the remote device corresponding to the selected representation.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Humpleman teaches the user interface functions on the remote device include selecting output and changing output (fig. 11).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Humpleman teaches: Monitoring the interaction of the user with the display of the one more representations (user selects on 712 buttons of fig. 11); and storing data representative of the monitored interaction (it is inherent in Humpleman's system that the visited web pages will be stored in the temporary memory), the monitored interaction data capable of being used to configure the display of the representation (it is

inherent in Humpleman's system that the visited web pages in the temporary catch memory will be used to configure the display of the representation).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Humpleman teaches: identifying a resource on the remote device with which the user interacts; and loading a user interface corresponding to the identified resource (fig. 11).

As per independent claim 9, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

As per independent claim 13, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Humpleman teaches the resource is a web page (col. 7, lines 48-51).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, wherein the evaluated interaction includes selecting an icon (col. 7, line 44).

As per independent claim 19, Humpleman teaches a method of loading a user interface, comprising: accessing a resource on a remote device through a network (col. 7, lines 7-9);
evaluating interaction of a user with the resource; identifying the resource based on the evaluated interaction; and loading a user interface corresponding to the identified resource (col. 7, lines 41-46);
receiving, through the network to the information appliance, user interface data describing one or more user interface functions on the remote device, wherein at least some of the one or more user interface functions may be added to the information appliance from the remote device (col. 7, lines 6-7 and col. 7, lines 48-58);
assigning the one or more representations of the information appliance respectively to the one or more user interface functions of the remote device (column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 2);
programming the assigned one or more representations of the information appliance to respectively control the one or more user interface functions of the remote device (column 9, lines 21-29 and lines 59-63);
configuring the load user interface based on the user interface data, the loaded interface including one or more representations, each representation corresponding to one of the user interface functions on the remote device and capable of interaction by the user therewith (col. 7, lines 7-20 and col. 7, lines 48-58).

Humpleman does not teach comparing the user interface data with a user interface template of the information appliance, the user interface template including one or more representations. Rezvani discloses Web server 46 may take the template, locate components designated to device 32 using the components' IDs, and ask the components to generate a suitable user interface representation (page 9, paragraph 94). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Rezvani of generating a suitable user interface representation by comparing components' IDs to the template, locate components designated to a remote device in Humpleman's system since it would have helped to speed up the process of loading user interface representation;

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 19, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

As per independent claim 27, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per claims 30, 31, and 32, which are dependent on claims 1, 9, and 19 respectively, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

As per claim 34, Rezvani teaches the one or more representations include at least one of a cursor control element, a browser control element, or a window control element (page 6, paragraph 61).

As per claims 35-39, Humpleman teaches said at least some of the one or more user interface functions may be added to the information appliance from the remote device to configure the user interface of the information appliance (col. 7; lines 6-7 and col. 7, lines 485-8).

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Rezvani and further in view of Cragun et al. ("Cragun", US 5,973,683).

As per claims 6 and 7, which are both dependent on claim 5, modified Humpleman does not disclose the monitored interaction data includes an amount of time and a number of times spent by the user interacting with a selected one of the representations, and further wherein the display of the representations is configured to include the selected representation is greater than a threshold amount of time and number of times. Cragun discloses content displayed on the television is controlled based on a viewer profile that monitors the quantity of time a viewer spends viewing content (col. 6, lines 1-28). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching

from Cragun of displaying the content on the television based on a viewer profile that monitors the quantity of time a viewer spends viewing content in modified Humpleman's system since it would control the display content in response to the past behavior of a viewer.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that the prior arts do not teach or suggest "assigning the one or more representations of the information appliance respectively to the one or more user interface functions of the remote device" and "programming the assigned one or more representations of the information appliance to respectively control the one or more user interface functions of the remote device". However, Applicant's attention is directed to column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 2 of Humpleman, "...each home device is associated with one or more Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) files. The HTML files define the control and command functions associated with a particular home device. Each HTML file may also contain embedded references to other HTML files..."

Besides, Humpleman also teaches "programming the assigned one or more representations..." at column 9, lines 21-29 and lines 59-63.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER